

Cohomological dimension of complexes

Mohammad T. Dibaei ^{ab} and Siamak Yassemi ^{ca}

(a) *Institute for Studies in Theoretical Physics and Mathematics*

(b) *Department of Mathematics, Teacher Training University*

(c) *Department of Mathematics, University of Tehran.*

Abstract

In the derived category of the category of modules over a commutative Noetherian ring R , we define, for an ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ of R , two different types of cohomological dimensions of a complex X in a certain subcategory of the derived category, namely $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X) = \sup\{\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, H_\ell(X)) - \ell \mid \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ and $-\inf \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(X)$, where $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, M) = \sup\{\ell \in \mathbb{Z} \mid H_{\mathfrak{a}}^\ell(M) \neq 0\}$ for an R -module M . In this paper, it is shown, among other things, that, for any complex X bounded to the left, $-\inf \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(X) \leq \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X)$ and equality holds if indeed $H(X)$ is finitely generated.

0. Introduction

Let R be a commutative Noetherian ring of finite dimension d and $\mathfrak{a}$ be an ideal of R . For an R -module M , $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)$ is defined to be the submodule of M consisting of all elements of M which are vanished by some power of $\mathfrak{a}$. It has been an interesting question to know when $H_{\mathfrak{a}}^i(M)$, the i -th right derived functor of $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(-)$ applied on M , is zero (see [Hu]). The cohomological dimension of M with respect to $\mathfrak{a}$ is defined as

$$\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, M) = \sup\{i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid H_{\mathfrak{a}}^i(M) \neq 0\}.$$

2000 *Mathematics subject classification.* 13D45.

Key words and phrases. Local cohomology, cohomological dimension, complexes of modules.

In [G] Grothendieck has shown that $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, M)$ has a lower bound and an upper bound $\text{depth } M$ and $\dim M$ respectively. The cohomological dimension has been studied by several authors. In [Fa] Falting and in [HL] Huneke–Lyubeznik have found several upper bounds for cohomological dimension. In [DNT], some lower bounds have been obtained.

In section 1, we study the cohomological dimension of a module in more details. We show that for an R -module M , $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, M) \leq \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p})$ for some $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Supp}_R(M)$ and equality holds if M is finite (that is finitely generated) and in this case $\mathfrak{p}$ may be taken from the set of minimal elements of $\text{Supp}_R(M)$ (Theorem 1.3).

In the derived category $\mathcal{D}(R)$, for a complex X , the $\mathfrak{a}$ -depth of X is defined by the following formula, cf. [I; Section 2]:

$$\text{depth}(\mathfrak{a}, X) = \inf\{\ell \in \mathbb{Z} \mid H_{-\ell}(\mathbf{R}\text{Hom}_R(R/\mathfrak{a}, X)) \neq 0\}.$$

In [FI; Theorem 2.1], Foxby and Iyengar have shown that, for any complex X ,

$$\text{depth}(\mathfrak{a}, X) = -\sup \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(X).$$

In this paper we are specially interested in $\inf \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(X)$. It is clear that for an R -module M , $-\inf \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(M) = \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, M)$ and so by Grothendieck's result, we have $-\inf \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(M) \leq \dim(M)$. What is cited is our motivation to study the invariant $-\inf \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(X)$. On the other hand, for a complex X bounded to the left, in consistent with the definition of the dimension of X as $\dim X = \sup\{\dim_R H_{\ell}(X) - \ell \mid \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, we may define cohomological dimension of X as $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X) = \sup\{\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, H_{\ell}(X)) - \ell \mid \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Our purpose is to clarify the relationship between $\inf \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(X)$ and $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X)$.

We first study $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X)$ in section 2. As $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, M)$ is well behaved when M is a finite module, most results of this section are in the case X has finite homology modules, for example: If X, Y are complexes bounded to the left with finite homology modules then

$$\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} Y) = \sup\{\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, H_t(X) \otimes_R H_{\ell}(Y)) - \ell - t \mid t, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\} \quad (\text{see Theorem 2.9}),$$

and we have

$$\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} Y) \leq \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X) - \inf Y \quad (\text{see Theorem 2.10}).$$

Moreover, there are some results which X does not need to have finite homology modules, for example: If X is a bounded to the left complex, then

$$\mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X) \leq \mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R) - \inf X \quad (\text{see Proposition 2.5}).$$

In section 3, we compare $\mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X)$ with $-\inf \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(X)$. More precisely, we show that for any bounded to the left complex X the invariant $-\inf \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(X)$ has a lower and an upper bounds $\mathrm{depth}(\mathfrak{a}, X)$ and $\mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X)$ respectively; and it takes its upper bound when indeed the homology modules of X are finite (see Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.3).

1. Cohomological dimension of a module

In this section, we have a brief look at the cohomological dimension of a module to find some extra properties (see Theorem 1.2) and to give an extension of [DNT; Theorem 2.2] (see Theorem 1.5).

First recall the well-known fact about $\mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R)$ which states that

$$(1.0.1) \quad \text{For any } R\text{-module } M, \mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, M) \leq \mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R).$$

The following result will be helpful to remove the finiteness condition on the modules.

Theorem 1.1. If M is an R -module, then

$$\mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, M) \leq \sup\{\mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, N) \mid N \text{ is a finite submodule of } M\}.$$

Proof. It is well-known that M is equal to the direct limit of its finite submodules. Now the assertion follows from the fact that the local cohomology functor commutes with the direct limit. $\square$

Lemma 1.2. If M is an R -module and $\mathfrak{b}$ is an ideal with $\mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}_R(M)$, then

$$\mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, M) \leq \mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{b}).$$

Proof. As M is an $R/\mathfrak{b}$ -module, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, M) &= \mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}(R/\mathfrak{b}), M) \\ &\leq \mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}(R/\mathfrak{b}), R/\mathfrak{b}) \\ &= \mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{b}). \end{aligned}$$

The equalities hold by independence theorem on local cohomology and the inequality holds by (1.0.1). $\square$

Theorem 1.3. If M is an R -module with finite cohomological dimension with respect to $\mathfrak{a}$, then $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, M) \leq \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p})$ for some $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Supp}_R(M)$. Moreover, if M is finite, the equality holds and $\mathfrak{p}$ can be taken from the set, $\text{MinSupp}_R(M)$, of minimal elements of $\text{Supp}_R(M)$.

Proof. By Theorem 1.1, there exists a finite submodule K of M such that $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, M) \leq \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, K)$, so it is enough to show the assertion for K . Assume the contrary. There is a chain $0 = K_0 \subset K_1 \subset \cdots \subset K_n = K$ of submodules of K such that, for each i , $K_i/K_{i-1} \cong R/\mathfrak{p}_i$, where $\mathfrak{p}_i \in \text{Supp}_R(K)$. Set $t = \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, K)$, so we have $H_{\mathfrak{a}}^t(R/\mathfrak{p}_i) = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Thus from the exact sequences $H_{\mathfrak{a}}^t(K_{i-1}) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{a}}^t(K_i) \rightarrow 0$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, we eventually get $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, K_1) \geq t$ which is a contradiction.

Let M be finite and so $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, M) \leq \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p})$ for some $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Supp}_R(M)$. On the other hand $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p}) \leq \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, M)$, c.f. [DNT; Theorem 2.2]. Hence the equality holds.

If $\mathfrak{p}$ does not belong to the set $\text{MinSupp}_R(M)$ then there exists $\mathfrak{q} \in \text{MinSupp}_R(M)$ with $\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{p}$. Now by using Lemma 1.2, we have that $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p}) \leq \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{q})$, that is $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{q}) = \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, M)$, and the claim follows. $\square$

The following result is a generalization of [DNT; Theorem 2.2].

Theorem 1.4. Let N and M be R -modules and M finite. If $\text{Supp}_R(N) \subseteq \text{Supp}_R(M)$, then $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, N) \leq \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, M)$.

Proof. By Theorem 1.1, $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, N) \leq \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, K)$ for some finite submodule K of N . Since $\text{Supp}_R(K) \subseteq \text{Supp}_R(M)$, we have by [DNT; Theorem 2.2], that $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, K) \leq \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, M)$. $\square$

Corollary 1.5. Let $\varphi : R \rightarrow S$ be a ring homomorphism and let M be a finite R -module. Then

$$\text{cd}_S(\mathfrak{a}S, S \otimes_R M) \leq \text{cd}_R(\mathfrak{a}, M).$$

If S is faithfully flat then the equality holds.

Proof. By independence theorem $H_{\mathfrak{a}}^i(S \otimes_R M) \cong H_{\mathfrak{a}S}^i(S \otimes_R M)$ as R -modules. As $\text{Supp}_R(S \otimes_R M) \subseteq \text{Supp}_R(M)$, we have, by Theorem 1.1, $\text{cd}_S(\mathfrak{a}S, S \otimes_R M) \leq \text{cd}_R(\mathfrak{a}, M)$. The final claim is clear. $\square$

The following example shows that the finiteness condition on M is not redundant in Theorem 1.4 and second part of Theorem 1.3.

Example 1.6. Choose a ring R , a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ and an ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ such that $\mathfrak{a} \not\subseteq \mathfrak{p}$. We have $\text{Supp}_R(R/\mathfrak{p}) \subseteq \text{Supp}_R(E(R/\mathfrak{p}))$, where $E(R/\mathfrak{p})$ is the injective envelope of $R/\mathfrak{p}$ as R -module. We observe that $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, E(R/\mathfrak{p})) = 0$ but $0 < \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p})$.

2. Cohomological dimension of a complex

An R -complex X is a sequence of R -modules X_ℓ and R -linear maps $\partial_\ell^X, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$X = \cdots \longrightarrow X_{\ell+1} \xrightarrow{\partial_{\ell+1}^X} X_\ell \xrightarrow{\partial_\ell^X} X_{\ell-1} \longrightarrow \cdots.$$

The module X_ℓ is called the module in degree ℓ , and the map $\partial_\ell^X : X_\ell \longrightarrow X_{\ell-1}$ is the ℓ -th differential, and $\partial_\ell^X \partial_{\ell+1}^X = 0$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$. An R -module M is thought of as the complex $M = 0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$, with M in degree zero.

The *supremum* and *infimum* of X are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \sup X &= \sup \{ \ell \in \mathbb{Z} | H_\ell(X) \neq 0 \} \\ \inf X &= \inf \{ \ell \in \mathbb{Z} | H_\ell(X) \neq 0 \} \end{aligned}$$

Denote $\sup X = -\infty$ and $\inf X = \infty$ if $H_\ell(X) = 0$ for all ℓ .

A morphism $\alpha : X \longrightarrow Y$ is said to be a quasi-isomorphism if the induced morphism $H(\alpha) : H(X) \longrightarrow H(Y)$ is an isomorphism.

The *derived category* $\mathcal{D}(R)$ of the category of R -complexes is the category of R -complexes localized at the class of all quasi-isomorphisms. The full subcategories $\mathcal{D}_+(R)$, $\mathcal{D}_-(R)$, $\mathcal{D}_b(R)$, and $\mathcal{D}_0(R)$ consist of complexes X with $H_\ell(X) = 0$ for, respectively, $\ell \ll 0$, $\ell \gg 0$, $|\ell| \gg 0$, and $\ell \neq 0$. By $\mathcal{D}^f(R)$ we mean the full subcategory of $\mathcal{D}(R)$ consisting of complexes X with $H_\ell(X)$ a finite R -module for all ℓ .

The left derived functor of the tensor product functor of R -complexes is denoted by $-\otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}}-$, and $\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_R(-, -)$ denotes the right derived functor of the homomorphism functor of complexes. We need the next two inequalities for $X, Y \in \mathcal{D}_+(R)$ and $Z \in \mathcal{D}(R)$.

$$(2.0.1) \quad \inf(X \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} Y) \geq \inf X + \inf Y \quad \text{and}$$

$$(2.0.2) \quad \sup(\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_R(X, Z)) \leq \sup Z - \inf X.$$

For a complex X , the dimension of X is defined by

$$(2.0.3) \quad \dim_R X = \sup\{\dim R/\mathfrak{p} - \inf X_{\mathfrak{p}} | \mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Spec} R\}.$$

It is shown, in [Fo1; 16.9], that

$$\dim X = \sup\{\dim_R H_{\ell}(X) - \ell | \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Therefore it is natural to give the following definition:

Definition 2.1. For a complex $X \in \mathcal{D}(R)$, the $\mathfrak{a}$ -cohomological dimension of X is defined by

$$\mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X) = \sup\{\mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, H_{\ell}(X)) - \ell | \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

For an R -module M , this notion agrees with the classical one. Note that $\mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X) = -\infty$ if and only if X is homologically trivial. If $\inf X = -\infty$ then $\mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X) = \infty$.

To find some extra information about $\mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X)$, we also review the notion of the height of an ideal $\mathfrak{a}$. If M is an R -module, the M -height of $\mathfrak{a}$, denoted by $\mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{a}, M)$, is defined to be the supremum length of chains $\mathfrak{p}_0 \subset \mathfrak{p}_1 \subset \cdots \subset \mathfrak{p}_n$ of elements of $\mathrm{Supp}_R M$ with $\mathfrak{p}_n$ is minimal over $\mathfrak{a}$. Thus, when M is finite, we may write $\mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{a}, M) = \mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p})$ for some $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Supp}_R M$, and that

$$\mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{a}, M) = \sup\{\mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p}) | \mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Supp}_R M\}.$$

If M is zero module then $\mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{a}, M) = -\infty$ by convention.

Definition 2.2. For $X \in \mathcal{D}_+(R)$, the X -height of $\mathfrak{a}$ is defined by

$$\mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{a}, X) = \sup\{\mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{a}, H_{\ell}(X)) - \ell | \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Now we have the following result.

Lemma 2.3. If $X \in \mathcal{D}_+^f(R)$, then

$$\text{ht}(\mathfrak{a}, X) = \sup\{\text{ht}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p}) - \inf X_{\mathfrak{p}} \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } R\}.$$

Proof. Consider $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $H_{\ell}(X) \neq 0$. There exists $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Supp}_R H_{\ell}(X)$ with $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p}) = \text{ht}(\mathfrak{a}, H_{\ell}(X))$. Thus $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{a}, H_{\ell}(X)) - \ell \leq \text{ht}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p}) - \inf X_{\mathfrak{p}}$ which gives a one side inequality.

For the other side, assume $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Supp}_R X$ and that $\ell = \inf X_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Thus $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p}) \leq \text{ht}(\mathfrak{a}, H_{\ell}(X))$. Now the assertion holds. $\square$

The following proposition compares the invariants $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X)$, $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R)$, $\dim_R X$, and $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{a}, X)$.

Proposition 2.4. For $X \in \mathcal{D}_+(R)$ the following hold.

- (a) $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X) \leq \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R) - \inf X$;
- (b) $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X) \leq \dim_R X$.

In addition, if $X \in \mathcal{D}_+^f(R)$ then

- (c) $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{a}, X) \leq \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X)$.

Proof. (a) and (b) are consequences of (1.0.1) and the Grothendieck vanishing theorem on local cohomology. Part (c) follows from the well-known fact that $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{a}, N) \leq \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, N)$ for any finite R -module N . $\square$

Proposition 2.5. If $X \in \mathcal{D}_+(R)$, then

$$\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X) \geq \sup\{\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p}) - \inf X_{\mathfrak{p}} \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } R\}.$$

Moreover, equality hold if $X \in \mathcal{D}_+^f(R)$.

Proof. We may assume that $H(X) \neq 0$. For $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Supp } X$, take $\ell = \inf X_{\mathfrak{p}}$ so that $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Supp } H_{\ell}(X)$. Thus we have

$$\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p}) - \inf X_{\mathfrak{p}} \leq \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, H_{\ell}(X)) - \ell$$

which implies the inequality.

Now assume $X \in \mathcal{D}_+^f(R)$. Let $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $H_\ell(X) \neq 0$. By Theorem 1.3, $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, H_\ell(X)) - \ell = \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{q}) - \ell$, for some $\mathfrak{q} \in \text{Supp } H_\ell(X)$, which implies $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, H_\ell(X)) - \ell \leq \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{q}) - \inf X_{\mathfrak{q}}$, the result follows. $\square$

Proposition 2.6. If $X \in \mathcal{D}_+^f(R)$ and M is a finite R -module, then

$$\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} M) = \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} R/\text{Ann}_R(M)) \leq \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X).$$

Proof. We have $X \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} M \in \mathcal{D}_+^f(R)$ so, by Proposition 2.5,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} M) &= \sup\{\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p}) - \inf(X \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} M)_{\mathfrak{p}} \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } R\} \\ &= \sup\{\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p}) - \inf X_{\mathfrak{p}} \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Supp } X \cap \text{Supp } M\} \\ &\leq \sup\{\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p}) - \inf X_{\mathfrak{p}} \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Supp } X\} \\ &= \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X). \end{aligned}$$

To prove the first equality, we proceed as follows.

$$\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} M) = \sup\{\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p}) - \inf(X \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} M)_{\mathfrak{p}} \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } R\}.$$

By [Fo1; Lemma 16.28], we have $\inf(X_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}}^{\mathbf{L}} M_{\mathfrak{p}}) = \inf(X_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}}^{\mathbf{L}} R_{\mathfrak{p}}/\text{Ann}_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}} M_{\mathfrak{p}})$. $\square$

In [A], Apassov defined the weak annihilator of a complex $X \in \mathcal{D}(R)$ to be the intersection of the annihilators of all the homology modules of X and denoted by $\text{Ann}_R X$.

The following result compares cohomological dimension of X with that of $R/\text{Ann}_R X$. It is shown, in particular when $X \in \mathcal{D}_+^f(R)$, that $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X)$ lies in the interval

$$[\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\text{Ann}_R X) - \sup X, \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\text{Ann}_R X) - \inf X]$$

of length $\text{amp } X = \sup X - \inf X$.

Theorem 2.7. Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_+(R)$. Then

$$\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\text{Ann}_R X) - \sup X \leq \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X) \leq \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\text{Ann}_R X) - \inf X.$$

Proof. By using Proposition 2.4, we can choose $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X) = \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, H_\ell(X)) - \ell$. By Lemma 2.1, $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, H_\ell(X)) \leq \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\text{Ann}_R X)$. As $\ell \geq \inf X$, the right hand side inequality follows.

By Theorem 1.3, $\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\text{Ann}_R X) = \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p})$ for some prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \text{Ann}_R X$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\text{Ann}_R X) &\leq \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p}) - \inf X_{\mathfrak{p}} + \sup X \\ &\leq \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X) + \sup X. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from Proposition 2.5, which implies the assertion. $\square$

The Theorem 2.9 expresses the cohomological dimension of $X \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} Y$ with the cohomological dimensions of the tensor product of the homology modules of X and Y . But first we bring the following auxiliary result.

Proposition 2.8. If M and N are finite R -modules, then

$$\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, M \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} N) = \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, M \otimes_R N).$$

Proof. We have $M \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} N \in \mathcal{D}_+^f(R)$, by [Fo1; 7.28 and 7.31], and that, by Proposition 2.5,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, M \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} N) &= \sup\{\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p}) - \inf(M \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} N)_{\mathfrak{p}} | \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } R\} \\ &= \sup\{\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p}) - \inf(M_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}}^{\mathbf{L}} N_{\mathfrak{p}}) | \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } R\} \\ &= \sup\{\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p}) - \inf M_{\mathfrak{p}} - \inf N_{\mathfrak{p}} | \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } R\} \end{aligned}$$

and the assertion follows by Theorem 1.3. $\square$

Theorem 2.9. Let $X, Y \in \mathcal{D}_+^f(R)$. Then

$$\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} Y) = \sup\{\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, H_t(X) \otimes_R H_{\ell}(Y)) - \ell - t | t, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Proof. We have $X \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} Y \in \mathcal{D}_+^f(R)$, c.f. [Fo1; 7.28 and 7.31]. By using [Fo1; 16.28] and Proposition 2.5, the following equalities hold.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} Y) &= \sup\{\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p}) - \inf(X \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} Y)_{\mathfrak{p}} | \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } R\} \\ &= \sup\{\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p}) - \inf(X_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}}^{\mathbf{L}} Y_{\mathfrak{p}}) | \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } R\} \\ &= \sup\{\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p}) - \inf_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}}(\inf(X_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}}^{\mathbf{L}} H_{\ell}(Y_{\mathfrak{p}})) + \ell) | \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } R\} \\ &= \sup\{\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p}) - \inf(X_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}}^{\mathbf{L}} H_{\ell}(Y_{\mathfrak{p}})) - \ell | \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } R, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\} \\ &= \sup\{\sup\{\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{p}) - \inf(X \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} H_{\ell}(Y))_{\mathfrak{p}} | \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } R\} - \ell | \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\} \\ &= \sup\{\text{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} H_{\ell}(Y)) - \ell | \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now the assertion holds by iterating the above technique and using Proposition 2.7. $\square$

Corollary 2.10. Let $X, Y \in \mathcal{D}_+^f(R)$. Then

$$\mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} Y) \leq \mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X) - \inf Y.$$

Proof. It follows from Theorem 2.9 and Proposition 2.6. $\square$

3. Cohomological dimension and the right derived section functor

For a complex $X \in \mathcal{D}_+(R)$, $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(X)$, the right derived section functor with support in $V(\mathfrak{a})$ applied to the complex X , has been studied by several authors, e.g. [AJL], [FI], [Fo2], [Fr], [L], [Sch], and [Y], whom have studied the invariant $\sup \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(X)$. In this section we are interested in $\inf \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(X)$.

The following result is a new form of [Fo2; Proposition 2.5] and the proof is similar, which H.-B. Foxby clarified to us in a private discussion.

Lemma 3.1. Let $X, Y \in \mathcal{D}_+(R)$. Then

$$\inf(X \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} Y) \geq \inf\{\inf(X \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} H_{\ell}(Y)) + \ell \mid \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Moreover, the equality holds if $X \in \mathcal{D}_+^f(R)$. $\square$

Now we are ready to prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.2. If $X \in \mathcal{D}_+(R)$, then $-\inf \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(X) \leq \mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X)$. Moreover, the equality holds if $X \in \mathcal{D}_+^f(R)$.

Proof. By [Sch; Proposition 3.2], there is a functorial isomorphism

$$\mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(X) \cong \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(R) \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} X.$$

Hence we have the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
-\inf \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(X) &= -\inf(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(R) \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} X) \\
&\leq -\inf\{\inf(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(R) \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} H_{\ell}(X)) + \ell | \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\} \\
&= -\inf\{-\mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, H_{\ell}(X)) + \ell | \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\} \\
&= \sup\{\mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, H_{\ell}(X)) - \ell | \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\} \\
&= \mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X).
\end{aligned}$$

The inequality follows by Lemma 3.1 and the second equality by [Sch; Proposition 3.2]. Now assume $X \in \mathcal{D}_+^f(R)$. Then the inequality becomes equality by Lemma 3.1. $\square$

To present the final result we remind the notion of $\mathfrak{a}$ -depth X , which is denoted by $\mathrm{depth}(\mathfrak{a}, X)$, and defined by

$$\mathrm{depth}(\mathfrak{a}, X) = -\sup \mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_R(R/\mathfrak{a}, X).$$

In [FI; Theorem 2.1], Foxby and Iyengar show that $\mathrm{depth}(\mathfrak{a}, X) = -\sup \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(X)$.

Theorem 3.3. Let R be local, $X \in \mathcal{D}_+(R)$ and that $\mathrm{depth}(\mathfrak{a}, X) < \infty$. Then

$$\mathrm{depth}(\mathfrak{a}, X) \leq \mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X).$$

Proof. One has

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{depth}(\mathfrak{a}, X) &= -\sup \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(X) \\
&\leq -\inf \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(X) \\
&\leq \mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X).
\end{aligned}$$

Now the assertion holds. $\square$

We end this paper with two questions.

1. For any $X \in \mathcal{D}(R)$ and $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Supp} X$ we have the inequality of dimensions $\dim X_{\mathfrak{p}} + \dim R/\mathfrak{p} \leq \dim X$, cf. [Fo1; 16.16]. Is there any similar inequality for cohomological dimensions?

2. If $X \in \mathcal{D}_+^f(R)$ is not homologically trivial and $Y \in \mathcal{D}_b^f(R)$ then by the Intersection Theorem we have the following inequality $\dim Y \leq \dim(X \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} Y) + \mathrm{proj.dim} X$. Is there any similar inequality for the cohomological dimensions, such as

$$\mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, Y) \leq \mathrm{cd}(\mathfrak{a}, X \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} Y) + \mathrm{proj.dim} X?$$

Acknowledgments. The authors would like to thank H.-B. Foxby, University of Copenhagen, for his invaluable help, specially for posting the latest version of the reference [Fo1]. The research of the first author was partially supported by a grant from IPM, and that of the second author was partially supported by a grant from University of Tehran.

References

- [A] D. Apassov, *Annihilating complexes of modules*, Math. Scand. **84** (1999), 11–22
- [AJL] L. Alonso Tarrío, A. Jeremías López, J. Lipman, *Local homology and cohomology on schemes*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **30** (1997), 1–39.
- [DNT] K. Divaani-Aazar, R. Naghipour, M. Tousi, *Cohomological dimension of certain algebraic varieties*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **130** (2002), no. 12, 3537–3544.
- [F] G. Falting, *Über lokale Kohomologiegruppen hoher Ordnung*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **313** (1980), 43–51.
- [G] A. Grothendieck, *Cohomologie locale des faisceaux cohérents et théorèmes de Lefschetz locaux et globaux (SGA 2)*, Augmenté d’un exposé par Michèle Raynaud. Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois-Marie, 1962. Advanced Studies in Pure Mathematics, Vol. 2. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam; Masson & Cie, Éditeur, Paris, 1968.
- [Ha1] R. Hartshorne, *Residues and duality*, Lecture Notes in Math., **20**, Springer Verlag, 1971.
- [Ha2] R. Hartshorne, *Cohomological dimension of algebraic varieties*, Ann. of Math. (2) **88** (1968), 403–450.
- [Hu] C. Huneke, *Problems on local cohomology*, Free resolutions in commutative algebra and algebraic geometry (Sundance, UT, 1990), 93–108, Res. Notes Math., 2, Jones and Bartlett, Boston, MA, 1992.

- [HL] C. Huneke, G. Lyubeznik, *On the vanishing of local cohomology modules* Invent. Math. **102** (1990), no. 1, 73–93.
- [Fo1] H.-B. Foxby, *Hyperhomological algebra and commutative algebra*, Notes in preparation.
- [Fo2] H.-B. Foxby, *Bounded complexes of flat modules*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **15** (1979), 149–172.
- [FI] H.-B. Foxby, S. Iyengar, *Depth and amplitude for unbounded complexes*, to appear in Contemporary Math.
- [Fr] A. Frankild, *Vanishing of local homology*, to appear in Math. Z.
- [GM] J. P. C. Greenlees, J. P. May, *Derived functors of I -adic completion and local homology*, J. Algebra **149** (1992), 438–453.
- [I] S. Iyengar, *Depth for complexes, and intersection theorems*, Math. Z. **230** (1999), 545–567.
- [L] J. Lipman, *Lectures on local cohomology and duality. Local cohomology and its applications* (Guanajuato, 1999), 39–89, Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math., 226, Dekker, New York, 2002.
- [Sch] P. Schenzel, *Proregular sequences, local cohomology, and completions*, preprint.
- [Y] S. Yassemi, *Generalized section functors*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **95** (1994), 103–119.

E-mail addresses:

dibaeimt@ipm.ir
yassemi@ipm.ir